



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY  
BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS  
2 NAVY ANNEX  
WASHINGTON DC 20370-5100

CRS  
Docket No: 5999-01  
6 December 2001

[REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED]

This is in reference to your application for correction of your naval record pursuant to the provisions of Title 10, United States Code, Section 1552.

A three-member panel of the Board for Correction of Naval Records, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 28 November 2001. Your allegations of error and injustice were reviewed in accordance with administrative regulations and procedures applicable to the proceedings of this Board. Documentary material considered by the Board consisted of your application, together with all material submitted in support thereof, your naval record and applicable statutes, regulations and policies.

After careful and conscientious consideration of the entire record, the Board found that the evidence submitted was insufficient to establish the existence of probable material error or injustice.

The Board found that you reenlisted in the Navy on 13 March 1964 after five years of prior active service. The record reflects that you received two nonjudicial punishments and were convicted by a special court-martial. The offenses included unauthorized absences totalling 254 days.

The record also reflects that during the 1210 day period from 16 April 1968 until 10 August 1971, you were an unauthorized absentee. While the request is not in your record, it is presumed that you submitted a written request for an undesirable discharge in order to avoid trial by court-martial for the foregoing offense. It is also presumed that prior to submitting this request and in accordance with applicable directives, you conferred with a qualified military lawyer at which time you were advised of your rights and warned of the probable adverse consequences of accepting such a discharge. It appears that your request was granted and, as a result of this action, you were spared the stigma of a court-martial conviction and the potential penalties of a punitive discharge and confinement at hard labor.

The record clearly shows that on 20 October 1971 you received an undesirable discharge for the good of the service in order to escape trial.

In its review of your application the Board carefully weighed all potentially mitigating factors, such as your youth and immaturity and good postservice conduct. However, the Board concluded that these factors were not sufficient to warrant recharacterization of your discharge to avoid trial for an unauthorized absence of nearly 40 months and your prior unauthorized absences of more than eight months. The Board believed that considerable clemency was extended to you when your request for discharge to avoid trial by court-martial was approved since, by this action, you escaped the possibility of confinement at hard labor and a punitive discharge. Further, the Board concluded that you received the benefit of your bargain when your request for discharge was granted and should not be permitted to change it now. The Board concluded that your discharge was proper as issued and no change is warranted. Accordingly, your application has been denied. The names and votes of the members of the panel will be furnished upon request.

It is regretted that the circumstances of your case are such that favorable action cannot be taken. You are entitled to have the Board reconsider its decision upon submission of new and material evidence or other matter not previously considered by the Board. In this regard, it is important to keep in mind that a presumption of regularity attaches to all official records. Consequently, when applying for a correction of an official naval record, the burden is on the applicant to demonstrate the existence of probable material error or injustice.

Sincerely,

W. DEAN PFEIFFER  
Executive Director

Copy to: Mr. Corregedore